

albinism in the species affecting both plumage and soft parts. The bird was trapped at Dungeness, Kent, during the routine ringing activities of the bird observatory on 18th October, 1963.

DESCRIPTION

Right wing: 2nd primary all white; 3rd primary distal two-thirds of outer web white, distal one-third of inner web white. Covert to fourth primary all white.

Left wing: 2nd primary all white. Covert to fourth primary with white tip.

Soft parts: Legs and feet appeared normal, but both hind claws and inner claw on left foot white; all other claws slightly paler than normal.

In all other respects the bird's plumage was apparently normal and its weight and measurements fell within the expected range for the species. The bird was probably a first winter female of the race *C. f. cabaret*.

DISCUSSION

Sage (1963) found that the Fringillidae accounted for 6% of the records of albinism available to him and of these the Chaffinch *Fringilla coelebs*, Corn Bunting *Emberiza calandra*, Linnet *Carduelis cannabina* and Greenfinch *Chloris chloris* provided over half the records. It would appear that the incidence of albinism in *C. flammea* is rather low, although it is, of course, a far less numerous species. During the past four years this is the only individual of the species among the 47 handled at Dungeness that has shown this condition. It is clear however that the sample is too small to justify any importance being placed on the percentage of 2.1.

Reference:

Sage, B. L. 1963. The incidence of albinism and melanism in British birds. *British Birds*, 56: 409-416.

The identity of *Antiornis grahami* Riley

by SHANE A. PARKER

Received 13th January, 1964

Antiornis grahami was described as a new genus and species by J. H. Riley (1926) from nine specimens collected at 3,500-4,000 feet on Mt. Omei in central Szechwan, and now in the United States National Museum. Deignan (1961) considered the series to be juveniles of *Cettia fortipes davidiana*, so far as I know giving no explanation for this conclusion. There seems no doubt that the specimens belong to the genus *Cettia*, but I think they are identifiable as *C. flavolivaceus* and not *C. fortipes*.

In his definition of *Antiornis* Riley made comparisons with *Tesia*, *Oligura* and *Neornis* (= *Cettia flavolivaceus*). He stated: "*Antiornis* shows a certain superficial resemblance to *Neornis* Blyth, but differs as follows: the primaries are broader, and the first primary proportionately longer, the tail proportionately shorter and the feathers narrower, the general plumage softer and more lax". Four specimens of *A. grahami*, kindly lent by Mr. George Watson of the United States National Museum, were compared with a long series of *Cettia flavolivaceus* in the British Museum (Natural History). The difference in tail/wing ratio alluded to by Riley was the only point validated by my comparison. The tail of *A. grahami* is proportionately shorter than in *C. flavolivaceus*, the tail/wing ratios being 75.6-86% for *A. grahami* (juvenile and adult) as opposed to 83.5-111% for various races of *C. flavolivaceus* (juvenile and adult).

The specimens of *Antiornis* are yellow beneath and olive above. Several *Cettia* species have juveniles so coloured, but only in *C. flavolivaceus* do adults resemble juveniles in the yellow ventral plumage. Juveniles of *C. fortipes* in the British Museum although slightly more brownish-yellow beneath than adults, nowhere near approach the yellow of the under parts of the *Antiornis* series, *contra* Deignan. If the *Antiornis* series contains adults, it belongs with *Cettia flavolivaceus* and it seems that two of the four specimens I examined are adults. Specimens numbers 306292 and 332578 showed uneven "hunger-traces" across the tail feathers, while in 297814 a "hunger-trace" formed a straight line across all the tail feathers. 297818 bore no discernible "hunger-traces", but was considered closest in plumage detail and texture to 297814. Thus in the first two specimens the marked rectrices had grown at different times in the course of a moult, but in the third all the affected feathers had grown simultaneously as in the first (juvenile) plumage. Also, in the first two specimens the parietal region of the skull showed the degree of inflexibility typical of full maturity. Damage sustained by the skulls of the other two precluded the drawing of any conclusions along these lines. It is concluded that 306292 and 332578 are adults, and that 297814, and probably 297818, is a juvenile. The last two have slightly softer plumage but the difference is hardly noticeable. Mr. George Watson, *in litt.*, states the type of *Antiornis grahami* (not seen) to be closest in colour and amount of feathering to 306292, an adult.

In summary, the series of *A. grahami* contains adults and is therefore referable to *Cettia flavolivaceus*. With reference to the proportionate difference in tail-length, *grahami* is probably a tenable race of *C. flavolivaceus* inhabiting parts of Szechwan; more Chinese material would elucidate the position. It seems clear that *Antiornis grahami* Riley can be relegated to the synonymy of *Cettia flavolivaceus* (Blyth) and not to that of *Cettia fortipes davidiana* (Verreaux) as suggested by Deignan.

References:

- Deignan, H. G. (1961) Type specimens of birds in the United States National Museum. *Smithsonian Inst. Bull.* 221.
 Riley, J. H. (1926). A new genus and species of groundwarbler from the province of Szechwan, China. *Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash.* 39: 55-56.

On the occurrence and nomenclature of certain petrels in North America

by W. R. P. BOURNE

Received 7th March, 1964

In the first volume of the *Handbook of North American Birds* (edited by R. S. Palmer, New Haven and London, 1962) a number of modifications of the classification and nomenclature of North American petrels accepted in the fifth and last edition of the *Check-list of North American Birds* published by the American Ornithologists' Union in 1957 were made partly on my advice. The more important ones were carefully documented and usually appear to have escaped criticism, but some minor points which did not appear to deserve such full treatment in the limited space available have been questioned in a review in the *Auk* 80:89, so it may be useful to place on record the reasons for these decisions here, together with a few comments on other points which have arisen since the book went to press.